

D R A F T

Council Resolution & CEQA Findings for *Plan SB GPU & FEIR*

RESOLUTION NO. _____

A RESOLUTION OF THE COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF SANTA
BARBARA ADOPTING THE 2010 GENERAL PLAN UPDATE
AND MAKING ENVIRONMENTAL FINDINGS PURSUANT TO
THE CALIFORNIA ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY ACT

WHEREAS, Government Code Section 65300 requires that the City of Santa Barbara adopt a comprehensive, long-term General Plan for the physical development of the City, and the 2010 City of Santa Barbara General Plan Update fulfills this requirement;

WHEREAS, in 1989, the City Council placed a non-residential growth limitation before City voters as ballot Measure E, which was approved and incorporated into the City Charter as Charter Section 1508, limiting non-residential growth to three million square feet until 2010;

WHEREAS, in 2005, the City Council initiated the *Plan Santa Barbara* process to update the Land Use and Housing elements of the General Plan to specifically address the sunset of Charter Section 1508, which regulates non-residential growth in the City and to reassess the City's capability to construct more than 40,005 housing units as specified by the Housing Element;

WHEREAS, *Plan Santa Barbara* is the planning process used to update the City's General Plan, including the Introductory Framework, Land Use Element and General Plan Map, and Housing Element, as well as incorporation of selected goals, policies and implementation actions into the remaining six elements to be updated in the future, including the Open Space, Parks and Recreation Element, Economy and Fiscal Health Element, Historic Resources Element, Environmental Resources Element, Circulation Element, and Public Services and Safety Element. The updated General Plan elements are reorganized and integrated at a policy level into a cohesive united document;

WHEREAS, *the Plan Santa Barbara* process includes the following four phases: Phase 1) developing baseline information; Phase 2) conducting public outreach and initial policy development; Phase 3) preparing draft General Plan and Environmental Impact Report (EIR) documents, conducting formal public review, Planning Commission certification of the EIR and recommendations to City Council related to the Plan, and City Council adoption of the General Plan Update; and Phase 4) Implementation of the updated General Plan;

WHEREAS, the updated General Plan is intended to guide future residential and non-residential development through the year 2030, and the goals, policies and programs contained in the General Plan Update address the physical, economic and social development of the City and reflect the community's values of "living within our resources," becoming a more sustainable community, and preserving the existing community character;

WHEREAS, the updated General Plan identifies allowable land uses, densities and programs that support and assist the production of a variety of housing types, including needed affordable and workforce housing to meet the City's state mandated Regional Housing Needs Assessment (RHNA) allocation;

WHEREAS, the Housing Element of the updated General Plan complies with California Housing Element law requiring that local jurisdictions update the Housing Element every five years and submit their updated element to the State Department of Housing and Community Development (HCD) for review;

WHEREAS, the public outreach effort for the *Plan Santa Barbara* General Plan Update (GPU) took place between 2007 and 2010, and included 45 City Council and/or Planning Commission public hearings and work sessions, 10 community workshops, 23 Advisory Board meetings, approximately 40 grassroots meetings, an informational brochure mailed to 36,000 City households and businesses, a youth survey administered to eight local high schools, and a website;

WHEREAS, on January 15, 2009, a Notice of Preparation (NOP) was issued by the City noticing the intent to prepare a full-scope Program EIR. The NOP was circulated to interested agencies, groups and individuals for a public comment period of 30 days. The State of California Clearinghouse issued a project number for the *Plan Santa Barbara* General Plan Update, SCH #2009011031;

WHEREAS, on January 29, 2009, the Planning Commission held a duly noticed EIR Scoping Hearing and received public comment from 10 speakers and Planning Commissioners related to the EIR scope of analysis. Thereafter, the Draft EIR scope of analysis was established by the City Environmental Analyst with consideration of the scoping comments;

WHEREAS, the Draft General Plan Update and Draft EIR were released on March 19, 2010 and underwent a 60-day public review and comment period ending on May 18, 2010, and on April 28, 2010, the Planning Commission held a duly noticed public hearing and received public comment from 22 speakers pertaining to the Draft EIR and Draft General Plan Update;

WHEREAS, written comments on the Draft EIR and the Draft General Plan Update were received from 15 public agencies, 16 community/public interest organizations, 45 individuals and six City commission and committee members. Volume III of the Final EIR contains written responses to the comments received on the Draft EIR and updated General Plan. The proposed responses to comments and public hearing notice were provided to public agencies that commented 10 days prior to the Final EIR certification;

WHEREAS, on June 22 and 23, 2010, the City Council and Planning Commission held duly noticed public hearings to discuss the Planning Commission's recommendations on key policies related to the final preparation of the *Plan Santa Barbara* General Plan Update and Draft EIR, and at the conclusion of the meeting Council requested a series of work sessions to provide additional detail on a number of important aspects associated with the General Plan Update, including but not limited to: an overview of the Proposed General Plan, Program EIR, Transportation Demand Management, and various policy directives for residential density, development and design policies, and growth management;

WHEREAS, during July and August, 2010 the City Council held eight work sessions that involved detailed staff briefings related to the General Plan Update policy document, the Program EIR, Transportation Demand Management, Residential Density, Development and Design Policies, and Growth Management and Development Ordinance. On August 10, 2010, the City Council provided summary direction to the Planning Commission and staff on how to proceed with preparation of the final *Plan Santa Barbara* documents for review and final adoption;

WHEREAS, on September 29 and September 30, 2010, the Planning Commission held a duly noticed public hearing to consider certification of the Final EIR. Following a staff presentation, public comment from 18 speakers, and review and discussion of the information contained in the proposed Final EIR and General Plan Update, the Planning Commission unanimously voted to certify the Final

EIR dated September 2010 for the *Plan Santa Barbara* General Plan Update making findings pursuant to State CEQA Guidelines Section 15090 and City CEQA Guidelines Section II.2, and including clarifying additions and edits to the Final EIR as identified in Planning Commission Resolution No. 013-10;

WHEREAS, on September 30, 2010, following the certification of the Final EIR, the Planning Commission received a staff presentation and heard public comment from two additional speakers related to the General Plan Update. The Planning Commission formulated its recommendations regarding the adoption of the *Plan Santa Barbara* General Plan Update which was informed by the information contained in the Final EIR, and voted 6-1 to forward those recommendations (Planning Commission Resolution No. 014-10) to the City Council for consideration;

WHEREAS, on October 26, October 27, and November 16, 2010, the City Council held duly noticed hearings, received staff presentations, and heard public comment from _____ speakers regarding the General Plan Update. After extended deliberations, the City Council made modifications to the General Plan Update as shown in Exhibit A;

WHEREAS, an Addendum to the certified Final EIR dated November 10, 2010 (hereinafter “FEIR Addendum”) was prepared in accordance with California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) Guidelines Section 15164 provisions, and the Addendum documents final changes to the General Plan Update and associated impacts that fall within the range of policy options, growth scenarios, and impacts studied in the Final EIR and do not raise new environmental issues;

WHEREAS, the Certified Final EIR document includes the following components: Volume I FEIR; Volume II Appendices, Volume III Public Comments and Responses; and FEIR Addendum;

WHEREAS, the *Plan Santa Barbara* General Plan Update policies have evolved over the course of the Plan development, the environmental review process, public input, and deliberations of the City Planning Commission and City Council, all as anticipated and required by proper CEQA and General Plan processing. CEQA analysis of the final General Plan Update was documented with the FEIR Hybrid Alternative analysis together with the FEIR Addendum as the final Project being approved by City Council;

WHEREAS, the City Planner is the custodian of the record of proceedings for the General Plan Update and Final EIR, and the documents and other materials which constitute the record of proceedings for City actions related to the General Plan Update and Final EIR are located at the City of Santa Barbara Community Development Department, Planning Division, located at 630 Garden Street, Santa Barbara, California. Copies of these documents are available for public review during normal business hours upon request at the office of the City of Santa Barbara Community Development Department, Planning Division.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED BY THE COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF SANTA BARBARA:

I. California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) Findings:

The City Council makes the following findings in accordance with the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA), Public Resources Code (PRC) Section 21000 et seq.; the State CEQA Guidelines, California Code of Regulations (CCR) §§15090, 15091, 15,092, and 15093; and the City Guidelines for Implementation of the California Environmental Quality Act (City CEQA Guidelines), City Council Resolution No. 94-064, §II.2:

A. CEQA Findings for City Council Consideration of Final Environmental Impact Report (FEIR) for the *Plan Santa Barbara* General Plan Update (GPU), pursuant to CCR §15090 and City Guidelines §II.2.k

The FEIR for the *Plan SB* GPU, as certified by the Planning Commission on September 30, 2010, was presented to the City Council together with the Addendum dated November __, 2010, and the City Council has reviewed and considered the information contained in the Certified FEIR and Addendum prior to adopting the *Plan SB* GPU.

B. CEQA Findings of Significant, Unavoidable Environmental Impacts of the *Plan SB* GPU (Class I Impacts), Reduction of Impacts, and Infeasibility of Mitigation Measures and Alternatives, pursuant to PRC Section 21081 and CCR 15091

The City Council makes the following findings identifying and explaining (1) potential Class I significant impacts that may result from growth in the City occurring to the year 2030 under the GPU based on analysis in the FEIR and FEIR Addendum, (2) measures incorporated into the GPU to lessen these impacts, and (3) economic, legal, social, technological and other considerations that make infeasible certain mitigation measures and alternatives identified in the FEIR to reduce these impacts, based on GPU analysis, public comment, and Council deliberations:

1. Transportation Class 1 Significant Impacts. The FEIR impact analysis of future development under the *Plan SB* GPU identified a significant transportation impact associated with peak-hour vehicle traffic congestion, as follows:
 - Projecting future cumulative traffic changes citywide is difficult and based on many assumptions, estimates, and uncertainties. Many factors affecting future cumulative traffic in Santa Barbara are outside of the City's control, including growth in the State and surrounding jurisdictions, State and Federal decisions affecting highway improvements, decisions affecting rail and bus transport, technological changes, and travel decisions by individuals and businesses.
 - The City has undertaken an extensive effort to evaluate the potential contribution to future traffic due to the City General Plan Update policies and associated future growth, including conducting citywide traffic counts, developing a citywide traffic model, and extensive research and analysis to document the effectiveness of traffic management strategies.
 - The FEIR identifies existing peak-hour traffic congestion at 13 intersections with levels of service that exceed the City criterion for defining impacted intersections (77% volume/capacity or greater).
 - The FEIR analysis of the original Project (initial draft *Plan SB* GPU policies) identified potentially significant peak-hour traffic impacts of an increase to 20 impacted intersections by the year 2030, with these impacts potentially being substantially reduced through application of Mitigation Measure Trans-2 Reductions in Traffic Demand (MM T-2) providing a robust expansion of Transportation Demand Management (TDM) programs, parking pricing, and alternative mode improvements for pedestrian, bicycle, and transit travel, but with a residual significant, unavoidable traffic impact.

- The FEIR analysis of the final GPU, as documented by the Hybrid Alternative and FEIR Addendum identifies potentially significant peak-hour traffic effects of 20-26 impacted intersections by the year 2030.
- Feasible changes to the initial project have been incorporated into the final GPU that will act to lessen peak-hour traffic congestion impacts, including the following: (1) reduction of the non-residential growth cap policy from 2.0 million square feet to the year 2030 to 1.35 million square feet for specified category uses with excluded uses estimated by the FEIR at up to an additional 0.5 million square feet; and (2) incorporation of Mitigation Measure Trans-1, Intersection Level of Service and Arterial Congestion (MM T-1), for installation of signal or other improvements at specified intersections, and establishment of an intersection master plan for physical improvements at specified impacted intersections. The FEIR analysis, including Fehr & Peers and Nelson-Nygaard reports, demonstrates that reduction of non-residential growth would reduce the amount of increase in peak-hour trip generation and associated congestion effects, and that the identified roadway and signal improvements would improve levels of service at specified intersections. Based on the FEIR analysis, these measures provide partial mitigation of identified traffic congestion impacts.
- The FEIR found that traffic congestion impacts could be further reduced to a substantial degree through application of MM T-2, but still with residual impacts after mitigation remaining at potentially significant and unavoidable levels (Class 1). The FEIR identifies all the EIR alternatives as resulting in some level of residual Class 1 significant traffic impact.

The City Council finds MM T-2, that would provide a robust expansion of TDM, parking pricing, and alternative mode improvements (and the equivalent policies analyzed under the Additional Housing Alternative) to be infeasible for economic, environmental, social, and other considerations, as follows:

- An up-front commitment to full implementation of MM T-2 measures does not represent the best City policy in the interest of the community and the objectives of the GPU to protect the local economy and community's character, and to live within our resources.
- The revised Circulation Element policies included in the final GPU retain the full slate of traffic-reducing mitigation strategies envisioned by MM T-2 as measures for further consideration, but do not direct up front whether or to what extent they will be implemented. As a result, more information beyond the scope of a program EIR level is needed to consider the effectiveness, design, and application of such traffic management strategies. The Santa Barbara community is also divided on whether these measures are advisable. The revised policies better recognize the uncertainties of the future over a 20-year period, and the importance of having community acceptance of such measures prior to implementation. The revised policies incorporate more flexibility on later determinations of the extent, timing, phasing, and location of TDM implementation, and incorporate more process provisions to ensure the prerequisite support by community stakeholders. The policies rely on the adaptive management component of the GPU which will monitor traffic congestion to assist in determining if and when such measures will be considered.

- The retail economy of Downtown Santa Barbara is in a substantial downturn as evidenced by vacancy rates, sales tax levels, and unemployment rates. Downtown business organizations provided testimony that there would be negative effects to the Downtown merchants from MM T-2 strategies such as on-street parking pricing that could cause Downtown customers to do business, shop, dine, or vacation elsewhere. Any such effects providing a disincentive for visitors to the Downtown could also affect the vitality of the greater downtown cultural life, such as attendance at theaters, concerts, art exhibits, and other cultural events within the Downtown.
- Public testimony was also received expressing concerns that installation of parking meters may not be compatible with the community character of the historical Downtown or the City El Pueblo Viejo district, and that, after the long experience of free street parking in this City, implementation of parking meters would affect quality of life.
- Initial implementation of the MM T-2 programs would require City fiscal resources not currently available. The City is presently undergoing a substantial economic downturn, and it is unclear when recovery will occur or when implementation of the T-2 measures would become fiscally feasible.

Further, if the potential traffic effects identified in the EIR do gradually occur over the 20-year GPU horizon, the City could choose to implement these additional traffic management measures to avoid or reduce congestion impacts. As such, some level of T-2 implementation and mitigation may well occur. Since under CEQA provisions, this does not represent an “enforceable commitment,” full mitigation credit is therefore not appropriate for purposes of the EIR analysis and findings for the GPU. Therefore, based on the analysis in the FEIR and FEIR Addendum, future development under the final *Plan Santa Barbara* General Plan Update is found to result in a potentially significant and unavoidable (Class 1) effect on peak-hour traffic congestion.

2. Climate Change Class 1 Significant Impacts. The FEIR and FEIR Addendum analysis of future development under the *Plan SB* GPU identified a potentially significant climate change impact associated with increased greenhouse gas emissions due to transportation fuel and energy use in buildings, from an estimated existing level of 1.358 million metric tons/year of carbon dioxide (CO₂) equivalents to a level of 1.571 million metric tons per year by the year 2030, a level that is not consistent with State-adopted objectives for greenhouse gas reductions. The FEIR found that projected possible increases in greenhouse gases could be substantially reduced but not eliminated through application of MM T-2, with the residual impact remaining significant and unavoidable (Class 1).

For the reasons described above under Finding B.1, City Council finds MM T-2 for a robust expansion of TDM, parking pricing, and alternative mode improvements (and the equivalent policies analyzed under the Additional Housing Alternative) infeasible for economic, environmental, social, and other considerations. Some level of MM T-2 implementation and mitigation may occur, however future development under the final GPU is found to result in a potentially significant and unavoidable impact on climate change.

C. CEQA Findings of Potentially Significant Environmental Impacts of the *Plan Santa Barbara* General Plan Update that are Reduced to Less Than Significant Impacts with Mitigation (Class 2 Impacts), pursuant to PRC Section 21081 and CCR Section 15091

The City Council makes the following findings identifying and explaining potential significant impacts in the City to the year 2030 under the GPU, which will be avoided or reduced to less than significant levels (Class 2) by measures incorporated into the GPU, based on analysis in the FEIR together with the FEIR Addendum:

1. Air Quality Class 2 Less Than Significant Impact. The FEIR identifies the potential for significant air quality effects associated with higher levels of diesel particulates in vehicle exhaust along Highway 101, which could temporarily affect potential development of future residential uses under the General Plan update on approximately 340 parcels within 250 feet of the highway before planned State regulations are implemented to reduce the effect. Policy language based on FEIR Mitigation Measure AQ-1 Highway 101 Setback has been incorporated into the GPU Environmental Resources Element to establish a temporary limitation to development of most new residential uses within 250 of Highway 101 until State regulations have been implemented to reduce diesel particulate effects, or the City otherwise determines that a project's particulate exposure level is sufficiently reduced. With inclusion of this policy measure in the final GPU, the FEIR and FEIR Addendum conclude that this significant air quality impact will be avoided and the residual impact will be less than significant.
2. Biological Resources Class 2 Less Than Significant Impacts. The FEIR identifies that gradual loss of native upland, creek/riparian, and coastal habitats and species associated with incremental development under the GPU could potentially be significant on a cumulative citywide basis by the year 2030, with existing and proposed General Plan Update policies partially lessening the impact. Policy language reflecting FEIR mitigation measures has been added to the GPU Environmental Resources Element, including Mitigation Measure Bio-1 Upland Habitat and Species Protection (MM B-1), Bio-2 Creeks and Riparian Habitat and Species Protection (MM B-2), Bio-3 Coastal Habitat and Species Projection (MM B-3), and Vis-1 Open Space Protection and Restoration (MM V-1). The FEIR and FEIR Addendum conclude that with these measures included in the final GPU, the significant biological resource impacts will be avoided, and residual impacts will be less than significant.
3. Geological Conditions Class 2 Less Than Significant Impact. The analysis of geological conditions in the FEIR identifies a potentially significant impact from the effect of continuing sea cliff retreat on a small number of structures that could be developed or modified near coastal bluffs over the next 20 years under the GPU. FEIR Mitigation Measure Geo-1 Coastal Bluff Retreat (MM G-1) providing for update of bluff retreat review guidelines and establishment of a shoreline management plan has been incorporated into the GPU Public Services and Safety Element policies. With inclusion of these measures in the final GPU, the FEIR and FEIR Addendum conclude that the significant sea cliff retreat impact will be avoided and the residual impact will be less than significant.

4. Hazardous Materials Class 2 Less Than Significant Impact. The FEIR analysis of hazardous materials issues identifies a potentially significant impact of inadequate community hazardous waste collection facility capacity for the next twenty years. FEIR Mitigation Measure Haz-1 Household Hazardous Waste Disposal Capacity (MM Hz-1), providing for City coordination with regional jurisdictions to establish additional facility capacity on the South Coast, has been included in the final GPU Public Services and Safety Element. The FEIR and FEIR Addendum conclude that inclusion of this measure in the final GPU will result in avoidance of the significant hazardous materials facility impact and a residual impact at a less than significant level.
5. Heritage Resources Class 2 Less Than Significant Impact. The analysis in the FEIR identifies a potentially significant impact to historic resources from gradual development over the next two decades under GPU land use policies. The GPU Historic Resources Element policies have been changed to include additional measures to protect historic resources, as identified in FEIR Mitigation Measures Her-1 Protection of Historic Buildings, Structures, and Districts (MM HR-1), including additional protections during construction adjacent to designated historic structures, and additional landmark and historic district programs, and additional development design requirements within buffer areas around designated resources and districts. The FEIR and FEIR analysis concludes that with inclusion of these policy measures in the final GPU, the significant impact on historic resources will be avoided and the residual impact will be less than significant.
6. Hydrology and Water Quality Class 2 Less Than Significant Impact. The FEIR extended range analysis identifies a potentially significant impact of increased flood hazards from sea level rise due to climate change. FEIR Mitigation Measure Hydro-1 Sea Level Rise (MM Hy-1) has been included in the final GPU Environmental Resources Element to provide for adaptive management for this potential effect as part of a shoreline management component of a climate action plan, and as a part of the groundwater management planning component of the Long Term Water Supply Plan. The FEIR and FEIR Addendum conclude that incorporation of these measures in the final GPU will avoid the significant long-range flooding impact, and the residual impact will be at a less than significant level.
7. Noise Class 2 Less Than Significant Impact. The analysis of noise impacts in the FEIR identified a potentially significant impact from a gradual expansion of the 60 and 65 dBA ldn highway noise contours affecting existing residential areas, due to gradually increasing highway traffic levels. With application of FEIR Mitigation Measures T-2 for robust TDM to reduce traffic increases and Noise-1 Roadway Noise (MM N-1) to monitor freeway noise level changes and implement strategic localized noise attenuation measures such as barriers and structure retrofits as needed, the FEIR and FEIR Addendum conclude that this significant noise effect would be avoided and the residual noise effect would be less than significant (Class 2).

The N-1 measure for monitoring and mitigation has been incorporated into the GPU Public Services and Safety Element. However, for the reasons cited above under Finding B.1, City Council finds Mitigation Measure T-2 for a robust TDM expansion (and the equivalent policies analyzed under the Additional Housing Alternative)

infeasible for economic, environmental, social, and other considerations, and an alternate policy has been included in the final GPU without the assured implementation commitment, which could result in somewhat greater traffic levels. Nevertheless, the N-1 mitigation would provide for monitoring of associated highway noise levels and mitigation as necessary, such that the potentially significant noise effect would be avoided and the residual noise effect would be less than significant (Class 2).

8. Open Space/ Visual Resources Class 2 Less Than Significant Impact. The FEIR identifies a potentially significant impact from gradual loss or fragmentation of important open space in the City and region as a result of incremental development citywide over the next two decades. The final GPU Open Space, Parks, and Recreation Element and Environmental Resources Element policies have incorporated FEIR Mitigation Measures Vis-1 Open Space Protection and Restoration (MM V-1) and Vis-2 Preservation of Regional Open Space (MM V-2) providing for planning and development policies to protect key contiguous open space in the City and region. With these measures incorporated into the final GPU, together with the biological resource mitigation measures for protection of habitats and creeks, the FEIR and FEIR Addendum conclude that these significant open space effects would be avoided and the residual impact would be less than significant.
9. Public Utilities/ Solid Waste Management Class 2 Less Than Significant Impact. The analysis of public utilities in the FEIR identifies a potentially significant impact of inadequate long-term facility capacity for solid waste disposal. FEIR Mitigation Measure PU-1 Solid Waste Management has been included in the final GPU Public Service and Safety Element to provide for continuation of City coordination with the County and other South Coast jurisdictions to establish additional long-term waste management facility capacity, and to provide for further City efforts toward increased diversion of solid waste from landfill disposal. The FEIR and FEIR Addendum conclude that with incorporation of these measures into the final GPU, the significant solid waste management impact will be avoided and the residual impact will be less than significant.

D. Findings of Less Than Significant (Class 3) Impacts of the Plan Santa Barbara General Plan Update.

The City Council makes the following finding identifying and explaining potential impacts in the City to the year 2030 under the GPU that will be less than significant (Class 3) due to existing City policies and programs and new policies and programs in the GPU, based on the FEIR and FEIR Addendum analysis:

Based on careful analysis of existing environmental conditions, extensive existing City policies and programs, and new General Plan Update policies addressing growth and the environment, the FEIR concluded that other impacts of the GPU and associated growth would be less than significant (Class 3), including those pertaining to air quality (County Clean Air Plan consistency, construction emissions, residential uses within commercial/mixed use areas), biological resources (creek water quality, coastal resources, and urban trees), geological conditions (seismic, geologic and soil hazards), hazards (accident risks, electromagnetic fields, hazardous materials, wildfire hazards), heritage resources

(archaeological and paleontological resources), hydrology and water quality (flooding, storm water run-off, creek, groundwater, coastal, and marine water quality), noise (airport, noise guideline change, mixed use noise issues), open space and visual resources (important scenic views, community character, lighting), public services (police, fire protection, parks and recreation, schools), water supply and other public utilities (wastewater, solid waste, power and communications), energy, jobs/housing balance, and socioeconomic effects.

E. CEQA Findings of Infeasibility of Alternatives pursuant to PRC Section 21081 and CCR Section 15091

As a programmatic analysis of a citywide general plan update for a twenty-year planning period, the FEIR provides an comparative impact analysis for a range of growth scenarios and policy options under community consideration, and concludes that some of the alternatives could potentially lessen some environmental impacts. The City Council finds that specific economic, legal, social, technological and other considerations make the alternatives identified in the FEIR infeasible, based on the FEIR and FEIR Addendum analysis, public comment, and Council deliberations, as follows:

1. No Project/ Existing Policies Alternative. The FEIR evaluates the comparative environmental impacts that would result if the *Plan Santa Barbara* GPU policy amendments did not proceed and existing General Plan policies continued into the future, with associated growth assumptions of up to 2.2 million net square feet of non-residential development and up to 2,800 additional housing units by the year 2030, and with existing land use policies and no change to TDM and parking programs. The FEIR analysis identifies the overall greatest impacts associated with the No Project/Existing Policies Alternative among all the alternatives analyzed, most notably with greater traffic impacts (from existing 13 to 26 impacted intersections), greater greenhouse gas impacts (1.62 million tons/year) and a worse jobs/housing balance (2.04 jobs/unit). The FEIR finds that impacts of the No Project/Existing Policies Alternative on local resources, hazards, services, and regional issues are similar in type and potentially greatest in extent, but could be mitigated.

The City Council finds that the No Project/Existing Policies Alternative is infeasible because it would not feasibly reduce impacts compared to the final GPU, and would not meet plan objectives as well as the final GPU.

2. Lower Growth Alternative. The Lower Growth Alternative evaluated in the FEIR assumes a policy set involving more growth limitations, with the intent to further protect and conserve community character, historic and visual resources, neighborhoods, natural resources, and facilities and services, with growth assumptions of up to one million net square feet of non-residential growth and 2,000 housing units to the year 2030, and with key policies including stronger building height and design standards, retention of current density provisions with reduced unit size provisions, and retention or increase of parking standards and no expansion of parking pricing programs.

The FEIR analysis finds that potential Class 1 traffic impacts (prior to mitigation) of the Lower Growth Alternative (18 impacted intersections) would be less than for the *PlanSB* project or for the final GPU, with lower Class 1 greenhouse gas generation (1.58 tons/year), and improved jobs/housing balance (0.90 jobs/unit). The FEIR

analysis identifies that other potentially significant impacts to local resources, hazards, services, and regional issues, would be similar in type and generally less in extent than for the *Plan SB* Project and Hybrid Alternative, and would also be mitigable to the same less than significant residual levels as the final GPU.

Many of the policy components contemplated in the Lower Growth Alternative policy set have been incorporated into the final GPU and evaluated as part of the FEIR Hybrid Alternative and FEIR Addendum assumptions, including stronger building height constraints and building design guidelines and more constrained areas for density incentives, to further protect historic and visual resources and community character and neighborhoods, as well as no reductions to parking requirements. As a result of these policy changes, impacts of the final GPU would be lower and similar to the Lower Growth Alternative with respect to historic and visual resources and community character and neighborhoods.

The final GPU has been changed to incorporate a lower non-residential growth cap policy which partially addresses traffic, greenhouse gas, and jobs/housing issues, but has not reduced it to the lower 1.0 million total non-residential limitation policy assumed for the Lower Growth Alternative.

Although the FEIR and FEIR Addendum analysis finds that the traffic and climate change impacts of the Lower Growth Alternative would be lower than for the final GPU, City Council finds that the specific non-residential and residential growth constraint policies of the Lower Growth Alternative make the alternative infeasible for economic, social, legal, and other considerations, as follows:

- The non-residential growth limitation policy of the Lower Growth Alternative for one million net square feet would not be economically feasible or advisable as the final GPU policy because, based on the cumulative square footage of non-residential pending and approved projects and square footage demolished but not rebuilt, as well as historic rates for minor and small additions throughout the City, a total non-residential growth limitation of one million square feet over twenty years would be too constraining to the ability of property owners and businesses to provide for some physical growth when needed to sustain economic vitality, and would therefore not meet the Plan objectives for promoting a strong, vibrant, and diverse economy, adequate stable long-term revenue base for essential services, and local jobs and employees.
 - The Lower Growth Alternative policy for limiting residential growth to 2,000 units over twenty years is not feasible for social, legal, and other considerations because (1) it would be inconsistent with the historic City policy not to limit residential growth; (2) there could be legal constraints with the ability to assure property rights to develop a reasonable use of the property; and (3) it would be inconsistent with Plan objectives as well as regional and State agency objectives to support and promote appropriate affordable work force housing to address issues of housing affordability, economic vitality, population diversity, and jobs/housing balance.
3. Additional Housing Alternative. Under the Additional Housing Alternative, the FEIR evaluates policies intended to further promote affordable housing toward addressing traffic congestion, jobs/housing imbalance, economic vitality, population diversity, and energy/climate change issues, with growth policies for up to one million net

square feet of non-residential development and up to 4,300 additional housing units to the year 2030, and with key policies for greater density/ unit size incentives, retaining current building height limits, a strong expansion of transportation demand management (TDM) and parking pricing programs; relaxing second unit standards, reducing residential parking requirements, and streamlining housing permit processes.

The FEIR analysis identifies the lowest Class 1 traffic impact for the Additional Housing Alternative (from existing 13 to 14 impacted intersections), which results from the low non-residential growth limit together with strong TDM and parking pricing programs, and also identifies lower Class 1 greenhouse gas generation (1.4 tons/year), as well as substantially better jobs/housing balance (0.41 jobs/unit). Other potentially significant impacts associated with local resources, hazards, and facilities and services would be similar in type, and potentially greater in extent due to the substantial additional housing development, but also mitigable to the same less than significant residual levels as the final GPU.

The final GPU has been changed to incorporate a lower non-residential growth limitation to partially address traffic, greenhouse gas, and jobs/housing balance, but not to the lower level assumed in the Additional Housing Alternative.

While the FEIR and FEIR Addendum analysis finds the Additional Housing Alternative to result in lower traffic impacts than the final GPU, City Council finds that the specific non-residential growth constraint, robust TDM and parking policies, and stronger housing incentive policies of the Additional Housing Alternative make the alternative infeasible for economic, social, legal, and other considerations, as follows:

- The non-residential growth limitation policy for one million net square feet under the Additional Housing Alternative would not be economically feasible or advisable as the GPU policy for the reasons specified under Finding F.2 for the Lower Growth Alternative.
 - The Additional Housing Alternative policy for providing a robust expansion of TDM, parking pricing, and alternative mode improvements (and equivalent T-2 mitigation measure) are infeasible for economic, environmental, social, and other considerations for the reasons specified above under Finding B.1.
 - Policies under the Additional Housing Alternative to maintain or raise building height limitations, and further increase the density range and extent of areas for higher density residential incentives would not adequately meet the GPU objectives for protecting historic resources and maintaining the City's visual character.
4. Original Plan SB GPU Project. The original *Plan Santa Barbara* General Plan Update project evaluated in the FEIR is based on the initial draft GPU policies (*Policy Preferences Report*, 2009), and includes a non-residential growth limitation policy allowing up to two million net square feet of non-residential development, assumption of up to 2,800 additional housing units, and policies for a moderate expansion of programs for TDM, parking pricing, and alternative mode improvements, and moderate density/unit size incentive programs to promote affordable workforce housing.

The FEIR analysis for the *PlanSB* GPU Project identifies the potential Class 1 significant impact (pre-mitigation) on traffic congestion to be 20 impacted intersections, with 2-3 intersections mitigable with MM T-1 for roadway/signal improvements, and substantial additional impact reduction from application of MM T-2 for robust expansion of programs for TDM, parking pricing, and alternative mode improvements, resulting in a lower residual Class 1 impact (post-mitigation) with many fewer impacted intersections. The FEIR analysis identifies greenhouse gas emissions at 1.62 tons/year and jobs/housing balance in approximate balance (1.44 jobs/unit). Other potentially significant impacts of the original *PlanSB* GPU Project associated with local resources, hazards, and facilities and services would be similar in type and extent with the final GPU, and also mitigable to less than significant levels.

The FEIR analysis identifies greater traffic impacts for the final GPU than would occur under the earlier *Plan SB* GPU project because the T-2 TDM mitigation would not be applied. City Council finds an upfront commitment to a robust expansion of TDM, parking pricing, and alternative mode improvements to be infeasible for economic, environmental, social, and other considerations for the reasons specified above under Finding B.1. City Council also finds the non-residential growth limitation of the original project to be too high. As a result, City Council finds that the original *Plan SB* GPU project is infeasible and would not meet the Plan objectives as well as the final GPU.

5. Hybrid Alternative – The Hybrid Alternative evaluated in the FEIR incorporated policy components from the original GPU project, Lower Growth Alternative, and Additional Housing Alternative, and reflected changes to GPU policies based in part on initial City Council discussions and in part on City Planning Commission recommendations. This alternative assumes a non-residential growth limitation policy of up to one million net additional square feet, 2,800 additional dwelling units, higher density incentive provisions than the original *Plan SB* GPU but applied to more limited areas of the City, an additional 50% density incentive for rental and employer-provided housing, and a policy identifying a slate of TDM and other traffic-reducing strategies for consideration only rather than the moderate expansion of these programs identified in the original *Plan SB* GPU.

The FEIR and FEIR Addendum analysis finds that traffic, greenhouse gas, and jobs/housing impacts of the Hybrid Alternative would be somewhat greater than the original *Plan SB* project and slightly less than the final GPU project.

Most of the Hybrid Alternative policies have been incorporated into the final GPU with the exception of an adjustment to the non-residential policy to 1.35 million square feet, and adjustment to the General Plan Map to further reduce the area extent for higher density incentive designations.

The City Council finds the Hybrid Alternative to be infeasible for the following economic, social, and other considerations as follows:

- The non-residential growth limitation policy for one million net square feet under the Hybrid Alternative would not be economically feasible or advisable as the GPU policy for the reasons specified under Finding F.2 for the Lower Growth Alternative.

- The Hybrid Alternative density incentive policies with greater extent of areas for higher density residential than the final GPU would not adequately meet the GPU objectives for protecting historic resources and maintaining the City’s visual character

F. CEQA Statement of Overriding Considerations pursuant to PRC Section 21081 and CCR Section 15093

Based on the Final Program EIR for the *Plan Santa Barbara* General Plan Update together with the FEIR Addendum, the City Council identifies potentially significant and unavoidable impacts associated with traffic and greenhouse gas generation, as identified in finding I.B above.

The California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) requires decision-making agencies to balance the economic, legal, social, technological, and other benefits of a proposed plan, including region-wide and statewide environmental benefits, against its unavoidable environmental effects when determining whether and how to approve the plan. If the specific economic, legal, social, technological, or other benefits outweigh the unavoidable adverse environmental effects, then the adverse environmental effects may be deemed acceptable.

In accordance with Section 21081 of the California Environmental Quality Act and Section 15093 of the State CEQA Guidelines, after careful consideration of the environmental documents, staff reports, public testimony, Planning Commission recommendations, and other evidence contained in the administrative record, the City Council makes the following Statement of Overriding Considerations setting forth the specific overriding economic, legal, social, technological, environmental, and other benefits of the proposed General Plan Update that warrant approval of the Plan notwithstanding that all identified environmental impacts are not fully mitigated to insignificant levels. The remaining significant effects on the environment are deemed acceptable due to these findings:

1. Recognizing that there are trade-offs among various plan objectives, and differences of opinion within the Santa Barbara community as to the best balance of policies, and based on careful consideration of community input and Plan analysis, the City Council finds that the final General Plan Update (GPU) policies provide the best long-term balance of policies for meeting the plan objectives to accomplish the following:
 - Promote a strong economy and a stable long-term revenue base necessary for essential services and community enhancements, through land use policies that support business and employee needs, job opportunities, a variety of business sizes and types, educational opportunities, local businesses, and green businesses, and tourism.
 - Protect and enhance the historic and visual resources of the City and the character of established neighborhoods and the City’s Central Business District.
 - Live within our resources by balancing the amount, location, and type of development with available resources including water, energy, transportation, housing, and food.
 - Extend and update growth management programs to effectively manage resources and protect community character while permitting high-priority beneficial development.

- Support sustainable, pedestrian-scale in-fill development oriented to multiple transportation modes.
 - Increase the sustainability of City neighborhoods by promoting a sense of place with a focal community center and improved connectivity and access to daily necessities including limited commercial activity, transit, community services, and open spaces for gathering and recreation.
 - Improve the balance between the number of jobs and the number of local housing opportunities, support local jobs and employees, and support economic and social diversity through land use policies that support housing affordability.
 - Promote reductions in energy consumption, use of fossil fuels, and the City's contribution to global climate change through energy and green building policies, and creative land use patterns and transportation planning.
 - Protect and wisely use natural resources, minimize environmental hazards, and provide for present and future environmental, health, and service needs.
 - Maintain the unique character and quality of life of Santa Barbara as a desirable place to live, work, and visit, through policies supporting sustainable, well-designed development, social and economic diversity, and a healthy environment.
 - Strategically place new housing within or near commercial districts and adjoining neighborhoods for ease of access.
 - Improve the jobs-housing balance by improving the affordability of housing for all economic levels in the community.
 - Decrease reliance on the automobile and encourage active lifestyles through policies and improvements designed and intended to increase the safety, convenience, and integration of multiple transportation modes.
 - Provide adequate services and facilities for existing and future residents, and address the long-term effects of climate change on public services and facilities.
2. The GPU will allow for sufficient growth to continue economic benefits, while not unnecessarily exacerbating the jobs/housing imbalance and associated traffic effects.
 3. The GPU maintains community character with less density around City historic resources, which will also benefit the tourist economy. The GPU provides additional tools for preservation of the City's historic resources, including the new Historic Resources Element.
 4. The GPU Adaptive Management component is designed to allow for policy adjustments over time based on clear objectives and regular monitoring.
 5. The GPU provides for an emphasis on "community benefit" projects, including affordable housing.
 6. The GPU policies lower non-residential growth cap and provision of unit size/density incentives for affordable workforce housing benefit the South Coast region with respect to improvement of the jobs/housing imbalance and managing traffic and greenhouse gas generation.

7. The GPU maintains and increases opportunities and choice of travel modes, to benefit management of peak-hour vehicle traffic congestion.
8. The GPU promotes public health through policies such as Sustainable Neighborhood Plans, location of mixed-use are housing, and support for alternative travel mode improvements for walking and biking.
9. The GPU maintains and enhances the City's role in regional partnerships with other governmental agencies and community groups.
10. The GPU supports neighborhood grassroots planning and establishes a sustainability framework for the General Plan.

G. Findings for the Fish & Game Code pursuant to PRC Section 21089 (b) and Fish & Game Code Section 711.4

An Environmental Impact Report has been prepared by the City of Santa Barbara, which has evaluated the potential for the *Plan Santa Barbara* General Plan Update to result in adverse impacts on wildlife resources. For this purpose, wildlife is defined as "all wild animals, birds, plants, fish, amphibians, and related ecological communities, including habitat upon which the wildlife depends for its continued viability." The General Plan Update has the potential to result in adverse effects on upland, creek/riparian, and coastal habitats and associated species. Mitigation measures have been incorporated into the Plan such that potential impacts will be less than significant. The General Plan Update project does not qualify for a waiver and is subject to payment of the California Department of Fish and Game fee.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED BY THE COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF SANTA BARBARA:

II. Adoption of 2010 General Plan Update

The City Council of the City of Santa Barbara adopts the final 2010 *Plan Santa Barbara* General Plan Update, including the changes identified in Exhibit A, making the following findings:

A. Charter Finding

The goals and policies of the General Plan Update meet the intent of Charter Section 1507, "living within our resource limits". Policies included in the Update are designed to protect and preserve physical and natural resources, as well as to manage residential and commercial development so as not to exceed public services or resource capacities.

B. General Plan Findings

The General Plan Update has been prepared in accordance with Chapter 3, Articles 5 and 6 of the State of California Government Code. In compliance with Government Code Section 65300 et seq., the updated General Plan is a comprehensive, long-term plan for the physical development of the City. The Land Use Element designates the general distribution, location, and extent of the uses of land for residential, commercial, industrial, institutional, and open space as required by Section 65302(a) of the Government Code. The updated Housing

Element continues the City's commitment to provide affordable housing opportunities for all segments of the community and has been prepared in accordance with State law commencing with Government Code Section 65580. The General Plan and its elements are intended to function as integrated, internally consistent and compatible statements of goals, policies and implementation actions pursuant to Section 65300.5 of the Government Code.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED BY THE COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF SANTA BARBARA:

III. Adoption of Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program for the General Plan Update pursuant to PCR Section 21081.6 and CCR Section 15097

Mitigation measures have been imposed and made enforceable by incorporation into the approved General Plan Update. The City Council hereby adopts the mitigation monitoring and reporting program (MMRP) for the adopted General Plan Update, provided in FEIR Volume I Section 23.

Draft Exhibit A
City Council Changes to the General Plan Update
(Includes PC Recommended Text Changes)
November 16, 2010

1. Add the following paragraph per Council direction to Introduction page 28 to explain the intent of goal, policies and possible implementation actions that could be considered. Further explanation of how the elements are organized in the General Plan is included on pages 27 to 29 of the proposed General Plan document. In addition, each element includes an introduction page that explains the *Content of this Element*.

Plan Elements, ~~and the Required Seven~~ Goals, Policies and Implementation

The 2010 General Plan is comprised of eight reorganized elements, including the seven mandatory elements included therein. Optional elements include Historic Resources, Environmental Resources, and Economy and Fiscal Health. Each of the elements contains a set of goals, policies and possible implementation actions to be considered.

The **goals** provide the general direction and desired outcome for each chapter within each respective element. The State of California General Plan Guidelines defines a goal as, “a direction setter. It is an ideal future end, condition, or state related to the public health, safety or general welfare toward which planning and planning implementation measures are directed. A goal is a general expression of community values and, therefore, is abstract in nature. A goal is generally not quantifiable, time-dependant or suggestive of specific actions for its achievement.”

A **policy** is the method to achieve the goals, and typically there are numerous policies under each goal. The General Plan Guidelines defines a policy as, “a specific statement that guides decision-making. It indicates a clear commitment of the local legislative body.”

Implementation strategies are specific methods to achieve the vision of a more sustainable community and provide **examples** of programs and actions that the City **may** take to achieve the goal and policy. The General Plan Guidelines define an implementation strategy as “a rule of measure establishing a level of quantity that must be complied with or satisfied. Implementation strategies further define the abstract terms of goals and policies.” To underscore that these are examples of what may be undertaken by the City, the subheading “**Possible Implementation Actions to be Considered**” is used throughout the document.

2. Incorporate a revised “Culture” discussion similar to the existing Land Use Element (pg. 10) “Culture” into the proposed General Plan City Profile Section (begins on pg. 44).
3. Amend the General Plan document and associated maps throughout different land use designations and locations for Medium High and High Density (from what was presented on October 26/27, 2010) are adopted by City Council:
4. Amend Growth Management, Non-Residential, Pg. 67 section to reflect 1.35 million net new square feet as the next increment of growth with pending, approved, and government buildings excluded from the 1.35 million net new square feet (see recommended policy edits below).
5. Incorporate the following FEIR Recommended Measures outlined in Exhibit H of the September 29 & 30, 2010 Planning Commission Staff Report, as amended by the City Council on October 26,

2010 into the appropriate General Plan elements. Each of these Recommended Measures should begin with “The City should consider...”

Recommended Measures from FEIR	General Plan Update Policy
BIO-1: Upland Habitat and Species Protection	ER 12.3: Oak Woodland Protection
BIO-2: Creeks, Wetland, and Riparian Habitat and Species Protection	ER13.3: Native Species Habitat Planning
BIO-3: Coastal Habitats and Species Protection (Amend RM BIO-3.a., Native Habitat Restoration as follows: remove “enlarge” and replace with “improve”)	ER13.2: Multi-Use Plan for Coast ER13.4: Coastal Bluff Scrub Protection
GEO-1: Sea Level Rise and Coastal Bluff Retreat	PS9.3: Modify the Local Coastal Plan
HAZ-1: Accident Risks	PS8: Hazards Avoidance Policies
HAZ-2: Hazardous Materials	PS8: Hazards Avoidance Policies
HAZ-3: Wildfire Hazards	PS14: Wildfire Hazards
HYDRO-1: Flood Hazards	ER18.1: Creek Setback Standards
HYDRO-2: Improve Water Quality at Area Beaches	ER16.4: Pharmaceutical Waste Education and Collection ER16.5: Beach Water Quality Improvement ER16.6: Watershed Action Plans
HYDRO-3: Minimize Debris and Trash	ER16.7: Minimize Debris and Trash
NOISE-1: Nuisance Noise	PS10.3: Neighborhood Noise Reduction
CLIMATE-1: Carbon Sequestration	ER1.3: Urban Heat Island Effect
POP-1: Improved Jobs/Housing Balance (1.b. Job Creation)	Add to Economy and Fiscal Element, following EF20
POP-1: Improved Jobs/Housing Balance (1.c. Locations of Affordable Housing)	H22.10: Location of Affordable Housing
SOCIO-1: Interior Noise Reduction Home Improvement Program	PS11: Sound Barriers
VIS-2: Community Character	LG13: Community Character

LAND USE ELEMENT (pg. 91)

- Amend Policy LG2 and Implementation Action LG2.1 as directed by Council to increase the 1 million non-residential square feet to 1.35 million net new non residential square feet and specify the revised amount of non-residential square footage allocated to the Small Additions, Vacant and Community Benefit categories.

Limit Non-Residential Growth. Establish the net new non-residential square-foot limitations through the year 2030 at [1.35](#) million square feet, and assess the need for increases in non-

residential square footage based on availability of resources, and on economic and community need through a comprehensive Adaptive Management Program.

The 1.35 million square feet of non-residential development potential shall be allocated to the three following categories.

<u>Category</u>	<u>Square Footage</u>
<u>Small Additions</u>	<u>400,000</u>
<u>Vacant</u>	<u>350,000</u>
<u>Community Benefit</u>	<u>600,000</u>

Non-residential square footage associated with Minor Additions, demolition and replacement of existing square-footage on-site, projects that are pending and approved as of time of ordinance adoption, government buildings, and ~~sSphere of influence area~~ annexations are considered separately and in addition to the net new non-residential development established above.

Existing permitted square footage not in the City, but in the sphere of influence, that is part of an annexation shall not count as new square footage necessitating a growth management allocation. However, Once annexed, all development or developable parcels that propose net new square footage are subject to the limitations of the eCity's growth management ordinance. (LG2)

Possible Implementation Actions to be Considered

Amount of Non-Residential Growth. Provided it is demonstrated that it can be supported by available resources capacities, amend the City's Development Plan Ordinance (SBMC Section 28.87.300) to limit net new non-residential growth to 1.35 million square feet. Amend the non-residential development categories and allocation amounts to reflect this new development potential and definitions for each category. **(LG2.1)**

7. Amend the text of the Rental and Employer Housing Overlay Implementation Action to delete reference to 3 or more bedroom units. The focus of this implementation action is the overlay map. Policy direction for three or more bedrooms units that could be slightly larger is provided in Housing Element Implementation Action H11.10. Delete text defining areas because Rental and Employer Housing Overlay Map that is ultimately adopted by Council will reflect the areas where allowed.

Rental and Employer Housing Overlay. Encourage the construction of rental and employer housing, ~~including three+ bedroom units,~~ in the multiple family and commercial zones where residential use is allowed by providing increased density of overlays up to 50 percent ~~(over the Average Unit Density Incentive Program)~~ as shown on the Rental/Employer Housing Overlay Map (Figure _). **(LG)**

~~This incentive would not apply to market rental or employer housing in the area with the Commercial Industrial Land Use Designation and C-M zoning or the Coast Village Road area.~~

8. Amend Policy LG7 to read:

Community Benefit Non-Residential Land Uses. ~~Net new non-residential square footage that includes one or more Community Benefit Land Uses shall be of a secondary priority to affordable housing., Community Benefit Land Uses are determined by City Council and shall include one or more Community Benefit Land Uses~~ the following categories:

Community Priority.
Economic Development.

“Green” Economic Development.
Small and Local Business.
Development of Special Needs.

9. Amend Implementation Action LG8.2 to read:

Limit Residential. Better define residential uses in the C-M Zone to both encourage affordable housing and to protect existing manufacturing and industrial uses.

10. Amend Implementation Action LG13.4 to read:

Building Height. Amend zoning standards to include special findings and super majority approval by the Planning Commission ~~and City Council~~ for Community Benefit projects that exceed 45 feet in height.

11. Amend and move Policy LG14 and Implementation Actions LG14.1 through LG14.5 from Land Use to Historic Resources Element. See Historic Resources section below.
12. Add Implementation Action LG17.4 as recommended by the Planning Commission and staff and in response to the Upper East Neighborhood Association for consideration of the activities associated with long established institutional uses in residential zones:

As part of neighborhood planning, as appropriate, initiate and conduct studies in residential neighborhoods that have various established institutional uses. The purpose of the study is to engage those who manage these institutional uses in a discussion with neighborhood representatives and City officials to develop “best practices” for the conduct of activities associated with the institutional land uses in order to improve their compatibility with their adjacent residential neighbors on a voluntary basis. Such a study should be conducted in the Upper East Neighborhood that has a unique concentration of existing institutional land uses. Subsequent to this study, and the identification of best practices, these practices should be considered citywide, as appropriate.

HOUSING ELEMENT (pg 197)

13. Amend Policy H15 to read:

Secondary Dwelling Units. Second units (granny units) in single family zones shall be allowed within certain areas with neighborhood input to gauge level of support, but prohibited in the High Fire Hazard Zones to the extent allowed by the State laws applicable to second units. Second units may be most appropriate within a short walking distance from a main transit corridor and bus stop: (H15)

14. Merge Implementation Actions H15.1 and H15.2 as follows to avoid redundant language.

~~Second Units. Second units (granny units) may be appropriate within 10 minutes walking distance from a main transit corridor and bus stop. Consider incentives, such as: revised development standards for second units e.g., eliminating the parking requirements for second units, eliminating the attached unit requirement, reducing development costs by allowing one water, gas and electric meter and a single sewer line, developing an amnesty program for illegal second units. (H15.1)~~

Secondary Dwelling Unit Ordinance. Amend the Secondary Dwelling Unit Ordinance to provide more site planning flexibility and affordable-by-design concepts such as:

- Changing the existing size limitations to remove percentage of unit size and allowable addition requirements, and allowing a unit size range (300 – 700 s.f.);
- The square footage of the secondary dwelling unit shall be included in the floor-to-area ratio (FAR) for the entire property and shall be consistent with the Neighborhood Preservation Ordinance FAR;
- Eliminating the attached unit requirement;
- Changing the minimum lot size standard;
- Eliminating or adjusting affordability requirements;
- Allowing tandem parking and easing other parking requirements on a case-by-case basis; and
- Allowing one water, gas, and electric meter and a single sewer line;
- Developing an amnesty program for illegal second units which will comply with code requirements; and
- Developing guidelines and prototypes of innovative design solutions. **(H15.2)**

15. Amend Implementation Action H11.2 similar to 7 above and to specify land use designations where the rental/employer housing overlay is being recommended.

Affordable Rental and Employer Housing Overlay. Encourage the construction of rental housing and employer sponsored housing, including 3+ bedroom units, in the downtown center and identified areas of Medium High and High Density land use designations-the R-3/R-4 zones at affordable rental rates, by providing incentives such as:

- Increased density overlays up to 50 percent (over Average Unit Density Incentive Program).
- Higher Floor Area Ratios (FAR) when such standards are developed.
- More flexibility with zoning standards, (e.g., reduced parking standards).
- Expedited Design Review process.
- Fee waivers or deferrals. **(H11.2)**

OPEN SPACE, PARKS AND RECREATION ELEMENT (pg. 215)

16. Amend Policy OP2 to add “access and connectivity” of public open space as a consideration when acquiring, improving, or maintaining access from and through neighborhoods.

Open Space, Parks, Recreation and Trails Acquisition and Maintenance Funding. The City shall develop a variety of ways and options to support acquisition and maintenance of public open space, and new development and redevelopment shall contribute commensurate with the incremental need generated. Access and connectivity between open spaces shall be considered in future acquisition and maintenance funding.

HISTORIC RESOURCES ELEMENT (PG. 235)

17. Reorder and amend Historic Resource Element policies.

18. Move Policy LG14 (and Possible Implementation Actions to be Considered) from the Land Use Element to the Historic Resources Element as HR2 and amend to address the goal of maintaining the buffer areas as Medium/High Density. Also include language to allow some flexibility for higher densities for affordable housing projects that meet historic preservation goals.

Historic Structures. Protect Historic structures through building height limits, reduced densities and other development standards in downtown. **(LG14 to HR2)**

Possible Implementation Actions to be Considered

Reduced Densities. The Commercial Medium/High Density land use designation shall apply to those areas within 100 feet of historic resources. Flexibility to allow increased density for rental and employer housing shall be considered on a case by case basis if consistent with historic resource preservation goals of the city. **(HR2.1)**

Stepped Back Buildings. Stepping back buildings adjacent to historic resources and residential zones in the downtown urban centers. **(LG14.1 to HR2.2)**

Form Based Codes. Implement lower height limits in conjunction with Form-Based Codes where adjacent to historic structures. **(LG14.2 to HR2.3)**

Adaptive Reuse. Encourage the adaptation of the structure for uses other than the original intended use ~~When the original use of a historic structure is no longer viable, encourage the adaptation of the structure for uses other than the original intended use.~~ **(LG14.3 to HR2.4)**

Transfer of Development Rights (TDR). Create a residential TDR program for residential properties developed with historically significant buildings to enable the preservation of historical buildings without exceeding the recommended overall allowed combined General Plan densities of the parcels involved. **(LG14.4 to HR2.5)**

Historic Resource Buffers. Adopt the following City Policies and Design Guidelines as interim measures to establish buffer zones to further protect historic resources:

- a. Require all parcels within 100 feet of a Historic Resource located within the downtown center be identified and flagged for careful consideration by decision makers prior to approval of any development application ~~including increased bonus density proposals or consideration of increased densities for rental, employer and/or Affordable housing.~~
- b. Require all development proposed within 250 feet of historic adobe structures, El Presidio State Historic Park and other significant City Landmarks and the grouping of landmarks in close proximity to El Pueblo Viejo be subject to Preservation Design Guidelines to protect these resources. Protection may require actions such as adjustments in height, bulk, or setbacks.
- c. Adopt Interim Preservation Design Guidelines within 6 months of the *Plan Santa Barbara* General Plan Update adoption that outline suggested buffer protection methods establishing specific density, distance, setback, height limits, separation and step back criteria for new development on parcels adjoining designated Historic Resources. **(LG14.5 to HR2.6)**

Historic Resource Protection. Identify and/or designate Historic Districts or grouping of historic resources and consider additional implementation actions listed in LG13 ~~and LG14~~, such as

revised development standards, buffer protection and overlay zones to further protect historic resources. **(HR5 to HR3)**

Buffers. Establish permanent Historic Resource Buffers with priority focus on the historic adobe structures, the Brinkerhoff Avenue District, significant City Landmarks, and El Presidio State Historic Park. **(HR5.1 to HR3.1)**

Development Adjoining Designated Historic Structures. Development on parcels adjoining designated historic structures shall be designed, sited and scaled to be compatible with their historic neighbor and public enjoyment of the historic site. **(HR3 to HR4)**

Views. Review proposed buildings or additions to existing buildings on parcels adjoining designated historic structures as to how they may affect views of and from the historic structure. **(HR3.1 to HR4.1)**

19. Amend Implementation Action HR3.2 to consider harmful impacts to historic structures as a result of surrounding development.

Construction Adjacent to Historic Structures. Provide that construction activities adjacent to an important historical structure do not damage the historical structure. For projects involving substantial demolition and/or grading adjacent to an important historical structure, include any necessary measures to provide that such construction activities do not damage the historical structure, as determined in consultation with the City Urban Historian, or in approved Historic Structures Report recommendations. Such measures could include participation by a structural engineer and/or an historical architect familiar with historic preservation and construction in the planning and design of demolition or construction adjacent to important historic structures.

Where appropriate, require an evaluation study and mitigation for potential damage of certain significant historic structures (e.g., older adobe structures) shall be considered when adjacent development might result in a change in micro-climate of the affected historic structure. The evaluation study shall include a comparative assessment of potential harmful impacts that may result to the exterior or interior of the historic structure. Impacts to be studied may consist of the following: air circulation, humidity, temperature, heating and cooling dynamics, noise, vibration, air quality, light and shade conditions. The goal is to ensure no significant long-term harm or negative impacts would result in the condition or environment of the historic structure. **(HR3.2 to HR4.2)**

ENVIRONMENTAL RESOURCES ELEMENT (pg. 239)

20. Add language to Policy ER7 that allows development within buffer areas if the City can determine that diesel emission risks can be reduced, or until the CARB develops additional regulations.

Highway 101 Set-Back. New development of residential or other sensitive receptors (excluding minor additions or remodels of existing homes or one unit on vacant property) on lots of record within 250 feet of U.S. Hwy 101 will be prohibited in the interim period until California Air Resources Board (CARB) phased diesel emissions regulations are implemented and/or until the City determines that diesel emission risks can be satisfactorily reduced. The City will monitor the progress of CARB efforts and progress on other potential efforts or measures to address diesel emissions risks. **(ER7)**

21. Add a new Implementation Action under policy ER25 to address Coastal Bluff Determinations to read:

Site Specific Coastal Bluff Location Analysis. Any mapped illustration, description of, or reference to a “coastal bluff” in the *Plan Santa Barbara* planning, background, or environmental documents should trigger the requirement for professional site-specific coastal bluff location analysis as part of the application for development on a parcel, rather than to be a conclusive determination that a “coastal bluff” now exists, or at any time during the historic record has existed, on that parcel.

22. Add back as Implementation Action ER 17.3 the following draft program from the March 2010 Draft GPU that was inadvertently left out of the September 2010 Draft GPU:

Floodplain Mapping Update. Update the Flood Insurance Rate Maps (FIRM) floodplain boundaries for Special Flood Hazard Areas such as the Mission and Sycamore creek drainages and Area A near the Estero.

23. Amend Implementation Action ER27.1 to read:

Underground Utilities. Cooperate with developers and utility companies to underground as many as possible overhead utilities in the city by 2030. Establish a listing of priority street segments with realistic target dates in the capital improvements program and continue to support neighborhood efforts for undergrounding.

CIRCULATION ELEMENT (pg. 257)

24. Amend the following Circulation Element Policies and Implementation Action to read:

Transportation Infrastructure Enhancement and Preservation. Assess the current and potential demand for alternative transportation and where warranted ~~increase~~ the availability and attractiveness of alternative transportation by improving related infrastructure and facilities without reducing vehicle access. **(C1)**

Circulation Improvements. Where existing or anticipated congestion occurs, improve traffic flow in conjunction with providing improved access for pedestrians, bicycles and public and private transit through measures that might include physical roadway improvements, and Travel Demand Management (TDM) strategies and others. **(C6)**

Downtown Public Parking Pricing. Work with ~~Downtown~~ stakeholders to develop a public on-street parking program that will reduce commuter use of the customer parking supply and increase the economic vitality of Downtown. **(C6.4)**

PUBLIC SERVICES AND SAFETY ELEMENT (pg. 269)

25. Amend Implementation Action PS10.1 as follows to allow 65 dB(A) as the noise guideline for residential land uses but maintain the noise guideline as 60 dB(A) in single family residential zones.

Noise Guidelines for Residential Zones. Take into consideration the surrounding existing and future legal land uses in establishing noise standards for residential uses. **(PS10)**

Possible Implementation Actions to be Considered

Noise Levels. Update the General Plan Noise Element Land Use Compatibility Guidelines including establishing 65 dB(A) CNEL as the appropriate maximum outdoor noise level for residential land uses in commercial and multi-family zones while maintaining 60 dB(A) CNEL in single family zones. This ambient noise guideline for residential building construction shall assure indoor noise levels meet building code requirements of 45 dB(A) level. **(PS10.1)**

26. Add Implementation Action 10.3 to assess noise effects caused by non-residential activities and events in residential neighborhoods.

Neighborhood Noise Reduction. To further General Plan policies for maintaining quiet, high quality neighborhoods, require more detailed noise assessments for proposed special, conditional, and institutional uses with activities and events that may cause noise effects to residential neighborhoods. **(PS10.3)**

27. Add the following Policy to Public Services and Safety Element:

Fire Prevention and Creek Restoration. Coordinate fire prevention and creek protection planning through the development of a set of best practices, within and adjacent to creek corridors. **(PS14)**